

Serial No.: 10/645,687
Art Unit: 2165

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 1, 15, and 22 have been amended for clarification purposes. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Applicant notes the Patent Office's commentary on page 3 of the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006. Applicant has presented further elaborations on pages 7-8 of this response and requests that the Patent Office reconsider its position with respect to the outstanding claims.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-8, 12-20, and 22 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Alam, U.S. Patent No. 6,324,544, in view of Champagne, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0086199.

The independent claims of the present application recite the following features i) a formed data item is associated with a grouping identifier; ii) the grouping identifier is associable with at least one other data item for grouping the data items; iii) at least one grouping identifier is selected, and iv) data items between a first electronic device and a second electronic device are synchronized on the basis of the at least one selected group identifier.

Alam (US 6324544) discloses a solution in which data can be synchronized between a first computing device and a second computing device in such a way that undesired duplicate data can be avoided, e.g., in a situation in which a file is renamed on the first (or second) computing device. This is based on determining whether a file (or like) already exists in a computing device under a different name after adding said file into said computing device and deleting the file with the different name if it existed.

Champagne (US 2005/0086199) discloses a solution for transferring records between databases that may have different organizations of data in records of databases. The organization of data in records is expressed with a quantity expressing the number of data fields in a record and with information characterizing the data fields. A data field is characterised with "category" information that defines a type of information the field is meant to contain (e.g. a name of a person, an address, etc) and with "property" information that defines a format of data contained by the field (e.g. number of bits, integer, text, etc). In the solution disclosed by Champagne, a field map is established by correlating a plurality of data fields of a first database to a plurality of data fields of a second database using the above-mentioned information. Data synchronization

between the first and the second database is performed using the field map.

A person of ordinary skill in the art in combining teachings of Alam and Champagne would arrive at a solution in which: data can be synchronized between a database of a first computing device and a database of a second computing device, where the first computing device may have a different organization of data in records of its database than the second computing device (Champagne), and undesired duplicate data can be avoided e.g. in a situation in which a file is renamed on the first (or second) computing device (Alam).

This is a totally different solution from the subject matter recited in the independent claims of the present application. In the solution recited in the independent claims, a grouping identifier associated with a data item is used for grouping different data items to groups (e.g. a group for data items dealing with hobby, a group for data items dealing with work, a group for data items dealing with free time, a group for data items dealing with stock market, etc).

Therefore, the cited prior art publications do not as a combination or separately teach the subject matter recited in the independent claims: "said grouping identifier being associable to at least one other data item for grouping said data items".

Page 5, lines 9-11, of the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006, asserts the following:

The preceding text clearly indicates that the formed data item is the type of information the field is designed or meant to contain and the identifier is the category.

Therefore, from the Final Office Action:

- a) "a formed data item" (of the independent claims of the present application) is seen to correspond to "type of information a field is designed or meant to contain" (of Champagne), and
- b) "a grouping identifier" (of the independent claims of the present application) is seen to correspond to "a category of a field" (of Champagne).

Applicant believes that the intention was to draw an analogy between "a formed data item" and "information a field is designed or meant to contain," rather than between "a formed data item" and "type of information a field is designed or meant to contain," because "a data item" and "type of information" are not commensurate with each other.

Serial No.: 10/645,687
Art Unit: 2165

The argument is, however, valid even if the intention is to draw an analogy between “a formed data item” and “type of information a field is designed or meant to contain.”

Champagne does not teach that entities (an entity being information a field is designed or meant to contain, i.e., a data item) between a first electronic device and a second electronic device are synchronized on the basis of at least one selected category of a field (i.e., at least one selected grouping identifier). Therefore, Champagne does not teach the features iii) and iv) of the currently pending independent claims.

Page 5, lines 14-15, of the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006, asserts the following:

The previous text clearly indicates that a list of field categories (identifiers) for grouping of data items, which are contained in the grouping of databases.

The above assertion seems to equate “a list of field categories” to an entity that is used for grouping data items or the like, i.e., “a grouping identifier” (of the independent claims of the present invention) is seen to correspond with “a list of field categories” (of Champagne).

Champagne does not teach that entities (an entity being information a field is designed or meant to contain, i.e., a data item) between a first electronic device and a second electronic device are synchronized on the basis of at least one selected list of field categories (i.e., at least one selected grouping identifier). Therefore, Champagne does not teach the features iii) and iv) of the currently pending independent claims.

The applicant respectfully states that correspondences between entities presented by Champagne and entities presented in the currently pending independent claims should be similar for all the features i)-iv). For example, if the following correspondences: information a field is designed or meant to contain = data item and category of a field = a grouping identifier are used for comparing the teaching of Champagne with the independent claims of the present application, the correspondences should be used in a consistent way for all the features i)-iv) when comparing the teaching of Champagne with the currently pending independent claims.

On page 5, lines 1-6, of the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2006, the Patent Office admits that Alam does not explicitly teach the above mentioned features i)-iv).

Therefore, the cited references, Champagne and Alam, do not alone or in combination,

Serial No.: 10/645,687
Art Unit: 2165

make obvious the currently pending independent claims.

The Patent Office rejected claims 9-11 and 21 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Alam, in view of Champagne, and further in view of Hunkins, U.S. Patent No. 6,141,663.

Claims 9-11 and 21 are allowable at least for the reasons that claims 1-10, 12-20, and 22 are allowable.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Alam in view of Champagne or Alam in view of Champagne and further in view of Huskin, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-22 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-22 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/645,687
Art Unit: 2165

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski

Walter J. Malinowski

January 3, 2007

Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

1/3/2007

Date

Clarence F. Mian

Name of Person Making Deposit